

UNCLASSIFIED

IHSA-013

Revision: #1

28 August 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Evaluation Plan for Proposals in Response  
to RFP 23-81A

FROM :

STAT

1.0 Background

Request for Proposal 23-81A (Software Engineering Methodology, Standards, and Guides Development) was released on August 10, 1981. Proposals are to be submitted by September 3, 1981.

The following sections of this document describe a detailed Evaluation Plan. Care has been taken to ensure that the Plan is consistent with the evaluation criteria and guidance set forth in the RFP.

2.0 Organization

Committees, Boards, and Authorities and their make-up are as follows:

2.1 Technical and Management Evaluation Committee

STAT

2.2 Cost Committee

STAT

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

### 2.3 Selection Board

--

STAT

### 3.0 Procedures

The evaluation procedures shall adhere to paragraphs 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, and 2.4 of the RFP.

Procedures for Evaluation Committees are as follows:

Initial Evaluation - Evaluation Committee Members shall carefully review each proposal noting strengths, weakness, and deficiencies on the evaluation worksheet; on completion the evaluator will assign a numeric rating to each factor for each proposal. The committee shall then meet to discuss and average the results, rank the proposals, and determine those proposals in the competitive range (Section 2.3.1 of RFP).

Final Evaluation - Evaluation Committees shall repeat the procedures described for the initial evaluation when the final proposals are submitted.

### 4.0 Evaluation Factor and Weights

There are a total of 100 pts. spread across six technical and management factors.

Factor 1 - Staffing (24 pts.)

Capabilities and experience of key individuals (those assigned to the project full time), and supporting individuals (available to the project on a consulting basis) are to be evaluated.

UNCLASSIFIED

## UNCLASSIFIED

### Factor 2 - Corporate Experience and Capability for Software Technology Support (20 pts.)

Consider experience and capability across software technology arena including large software projects, design methodology, requirements definition, testing and verification, management practices, ... . (Note that Factor 5 deals with narrow range of experience, comparatively.)

### Factor 3 - Understanding of Work (18 pts.)

Evidence of understanding the SOW is to be evaluated. Consider reaction to SOW in the approach, task definition, and schedule. Perhaps offeror has a better approach - if so, give credit.

### Factor 4 - Understanding of Software Technology within Context of SOW (16 pts.)

Consider offerors views on software management, design practice, testing, configuration management, project planning, documentation, and other technology issues.

### Factor 5 - Corporate Experience in Managing Similar Efforts (14 pts.)

Consider experience in similar Standards efforts. Also evaluate under this factor the organization and lines of authority proposed for this project.

### Factor 6 - Methodology for Performing SOW (8 pts.)

Consider how well the offeror develops the ideas presented in the SOW, i.e., consideration of current Agency practices, consideration of other Standards efforts, methods for effective promulgation, selection of Standards to be developed, ... .

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

5.0 Scoring

For an excellent response, award 80-100% of the maximum points for a factor. Similarly for

Good	60-80%
Fair	40-60%
Poor	0-40%

6.0 Schedule

Sept.	4-11	Initial Evaluation
Sept.	11	Report on Initial Evaluation
Sept.	14	Written Deficiencies to Competitive Offerors
Sept.	21-22	Orals
Sept.	21	Revised Proposals Due
Sept	24	Final Selection

STAT

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

RATING FORM

Factor:

Score: Initial \_\_\_\_\_ Final \_\_\_\_\_

---

Strengths

---

Weakness

---

Deficiencies (Correctable Problems)

UNCLASSIFIED